

REMARKS

This Response, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated October 31, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-30 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-29 under § 102(e)

Claims 1-9, 11-19, and 21-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jacobs (USP 6,710,786).

The Examiner asserts that Jacobs anticipates the elements of independent claims 1, 11 and 21. However, as previously submitted and as further discussed below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration since Jacobs does not teach each and every element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites “receiving an *input object*, wherein the received *input object* contains *input data* and *one input function* executable on a computer.” In the Office Action, it is asserted that Jacobs’ “client request” corresponds to the claimed “input object.” It is respectfully submitted that Jacobs’ client request does not contain both “input data and one input function executable on a computer” since Jacobs’ client request does not contain an “input function.” Jacobs merely discloses that a client request consists of the client sending “the URL that was previously provided by the server which contains the state information.” Col. 3, lines 13-15. Neither a URL or the state information disclosed in Jacobs contains a function. (“The state

information may include the identity of the client, the ID and status of the operation..." Col. 3, lines 5-8.)

The Examiner asserts that Step 352 of Fig. 3A of Jacobs discloses a client request that meets all the limitations of claim 1. Jacobs merely discloses that in Step 352, the listener 210 passes forward a request by a browser to a web application server 280. In particular, Jacobs discloses that the listener 210 passes the browser request to a transport adaptor 212 which then converts the browser request as necessary to pass the request to dispatcher 214.

However, Jacobs does not teach or even suggest that the browser request *contains* input data *and* one input function executable on a computer as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner also asserts that at col. 2, lines 52-63, Jacobs teaches the claimed *input function*. In particular, the Examiner asserts that Jacobs teaches that a client request includes the state information for the operations to be performed at the server and that such state information contains functions. However, that portion of Jacobs merely discloses that a server processes client requests in a way that state information **associated with** multiple-request operations is maintained by clients making the requests. It is respectfully submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would not confuse state information with an input function and it could not be clearer that the client request does not contain a function as recited in claim 1.

In particular, Jacobs is directed to processing multiple request transactions in a stateless environment that does not require a servicing process to maintain transaction state information. See col. 2, lines 46-50. A server receives a request from a client for a multiple-request operation

and the server initiates the operation. The server or another entity, then processes the request.

After the request is processed the server assembles a set of state information associated with the operation. Jacobs discloses that the state information may include the identity of the client, the ID, and status of the operation. Col. 3:5-8. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the state information contains an input function.

On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that col. 25, lines 6-13 disclose that the state information contains functions. That portion of Jacobs merely discloses that the browser request includes “a context object that contains data required for the proper operation of the cartridge. The data required for proper operation of a cartridge may include, for example, a transaction ID that identifies a transaction with which the browser request is associated.” Col. 9, lines 20-25. A person of ordinary skill in the art would not confuse the data or information in the request with a function.

Jacobs further discloses that if the revised browser message is not associated with a transaction then the cartridge execution engine 228 forwards the revised browser message to cartridge 230 for the cartridge to perform the requested non-transactional functions *associated with* the revised browser message. Col. 25, lines 6-13. However, there is no teaching or suggestion that the state information contains an input function as recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims should be deemed allowable. Since claims 11 and 21 recite similar elements, claims 11 and 21 and their dependent claims should also be deemed allowable for at least the same reasons.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
Appln. No.: 09/364,370

Attorney Docket No.: A8494

III. Rejection of Claims 10, 20 and 30 under § 103(a)

Claims 10, 20 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Nakai (USP 6,253,248). Claims 10, 20 and 30 should be deemed allowable by virtue of their dependency to claims 1, 11 and 21 for the reasons set forth above, since Nakai does not cure the deficiencies of Jacobs.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 28, 2005